

c) REMARKS

The claims are 81-85, 89-96 and 98-100 with claims 81, 93 and 100 being independent. Claims 81 and 93 have been amended to better define the intended invention.

Support for the amended claims is found, inter alia, in Figs. 14A-C and 15A-C and the supporting disclosure therefore as in the Sixth Embodiment on specification pages 45-51. New claim 100 is supported by the First Embodiment as in Fig. 6B.

As noted in claims 81 and 93 the surface light emitting device and the photodetector are stacked on the substrate. Accordingly, the present invention includes a near-field optical system and a photodetector integrally arranged in a compact optical apparatus. The invention does not require an optical waveguide as noted in the last response.

Claims 81, 82, 89 and 93-96 were rejected as anticipated by Muramatsu '821. Claims 83-85, 90-92, 98 and 99 were rejected as obvious over Muramatsu '921, either alone or in view of Quate '190, Jain '706 or Watanabe '789. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The primary reference, Muramatsu, merely discloses an optical waveguide probe, see signs 6, 8, 8a, 8b and 8c in Muramatsu, column 3, lines 37-59. Muramatsu fails to teach the light emitting device and the stacked structure of the present invention or the bonded structure of claim 100.

The secondary references fail to teach that which is missing from Muramatsu.

It is therefore requested that the claims be allowed and the case be passed to issue.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter Saxon  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 24947

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 441555v1